From: <u>Jay Field</u>

To: <u>Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA</u>

Cc: Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA;

rgensemer@parametrix.com; Robert Neely

Subject: Re: Bioassay Interpretation at Portland Harbor

Date: 06/08/2009 12:34 PM

```
Eric.
Eric, please ignore the following statement in my previous email: "one sample with maximum tox level classification of 2 is affected (ie, samples that classify as level 2 for the endpoint but are not statistically significant and no other endpoint would classify >= 2). " there are more than one of those samples (all classified by either ch10s or ch10b) If you like I will provide a list of the stations affected and the tox results.
 Jay
 Jay Field wrote:
Jay Field wrote:
> Eric,
> attached is a file including control-adjusted values, significance,
> and tox level classification for the samples. As I mentioned
> previously, I did not take statistical significance into account. on
> sample with maximum tox level classification of 2 is affected (ie,
> samples that classify as level 2 for the endpoint but are not
> statistically significant and no other endpoint would classify >= 2).
> there are a number of such samples for tox level = 1. If those
> samples are an issue, we should ask LWG for a determination of
> statistical power (for Round 2, LWG classified samples as not
> significant, significant, or indeterminate).
> Jav
 > Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov wrote:
>> I agree. The message I left with John this morning was to figure out
>> what information we should exchange (us to them, them to us) to
>> facilitate this discussion. Can you could start to pull together a
>> similar package for the LWG?
 >> Thanks, Eric
 >>
 >>
                                                              Jay
  >> Field
  >>
            <Jay.Field@noaa.
                                                                                                                                                                         Eric
06/08/2009
 >> Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
                                                                                                          cc
Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
 >> AM
                                                                                                                                                            rgensemer@parametrix.com,
 >> JT0e
  >> Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Chip
 >> Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
                                                                                                                                                                                           Re: Bioassay Portland
 >> Subject
             Interpretation at
  >> Harbor
 >>
>>
  >>
  >>
 >>
 >>
 >>> Eric,
>>> before we talk with John, I think we should request a table from LWG
>> with raw values, control-adjusted values, significance, and tox level
>> classification. Without knowing what the discrepancies are, I'm not
>> sure what we would accomplish by having a discussion. Also, I would
>> like some more clarification on item #3, calculation of hit level. We
>> used the reference envelope value (REV) and 90%, 80%, and 70% of that
>> value to determine the thresholds. (all values are control-adjusted
>> values). this is the same as subtracting 10% of the REV from the REV,
>> but avoids potential compounding rounding errors.
 >> I'm available most of this week except Thursday.
 >> Jav
 >> Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov wrote:
                                   At the AOPC meeting, it became apparent that our interpretation of the sediment bioassay results did not match the LWG's interpretation. I am interested in understanding the basis for this discrepancy. Based on my review of the data, the bioassay results match up with the bins that we established in Table RE-2 in our March 31, 2009 direction to LWG (see previous email). Last week, I put in a call to John Toll to try to understand the LWG's interpretation. Although I did not speak directly with John, he left me a voice mail that described 3 possibilities for the discrepancy:
 >>
  >>
  >>
  >>
  >>
  >>
                                    discrepancy:
```